ASTROINFORMATICS 2019 CALTECH, 2019 JUNE 26

Can we predict (the future of) aperiodic sources?

Matthew J. Graham Center for Data-Driven Discovery/ZTF, Caltech mjg@caltech.edu





A history of predictive modelling Lometa 164 BCE 87 BCE 1066 684 ISTIMIRAN net; pmanebune inf 1456 1301 boran? f. aftabe. a' fai qu'i d 1145 here 1682 1835 1910

26 June 2019

Matthew J. Graham

F

Periodic sources in astronomy



Periodic sources in astronomy



Aperiodic sources in astronomy



- Accretion systems:
 - ➤ compact stellar sources to SMBHs
 - ≻YSOs
 - ➢planetary disks
 - ➢galaxy formation
- Chromospheric activity
- Boyajian's star
- Stellar associations



(Huppenkothen et al. 2016)

The challenge is to identify those phenomena that are unexpected for aperiodic sources (even for volatile behaviors) - periodicity

Characterization between different processes

Measuring (a)periodicity



- Harmonic analysis is based on the projection of a function *f* onto a periodic basis set but problematic with finite sampling of *f*
- Durrande et al. (2016) show how a Gaussian process with a (Matérn) kernel can be projected onto sub-reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces such that: $k = k_p + k_a$



0.1



The quintessential aperiodic population

 First quasar identified 3C 48 – most striking feature was that the optical radiation varied



- Physical origin of photometric variability in optical/UV is unclear:
 - Instabilities in the accretion disk
 - Supernovae
 - Microlensing
 - Stellar collisions
 - Thermal fluctuations from magnetic turbulence



Unexpected quasar behavior



- Flaring activity
- Microlensing

• Changing-state (changing look)



Stochastic vs deterministic



- Is it random? Or just very nonlinear? (Is it even stationary?)
- Ensemble of unknown processes means a large number of degrees of freedom => stochastic perturbation:

$$dX_t = \mu(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t$$

• Highly nonlinear system with bounded trajectory in phase space:





Describing quasar photometric variability

- $|\Delta m| > x$
 - DPOSS vs. SDSS (Stripe 82) vs. PS1
- Excess variability: χ^2
- Structure function



15.0

- Historic descriptor of variability and a variety of estimators
- Not much information







Damped random walk (DRW/OU)



$$dX(t) = -\frac{1}{\tau}X(t)dt + \sigma\sqrt{dt}\varepsilon(t) + bdt \quad \tau,\sigma,t > 0$$

- Characterized by variability amplitude and timescale
- Basis for stochastic models of variability
- Deviations noted (e.g., Mushotzky 2011, Zu et al. 2013, Graham et al. 2014)
- Degenerate model can be best fit for a non-DRW process (Kozlowski 2016)





Modeling as a Gaussian process



DRW = CAR(1) = CARMA(1,0) = CARIMA(1,0,0) = CARFIMA(1,0,0)

- (Zero mean) Gaussian processes are completely defined by their covariance function (kernel function)
- No closed form for (super)parent models
- Fractional Brownian motion is equivalent to CARFIMA and a Cauchy class separates characterization of the fractal dimension (roughness) and long range dependence

$$K(x,x') = \sigma^2 \left(1 + (|x-x'|)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \right)^{-\alpha}$$



Complex nonlinear model

- E TF
- Golestani & Gras (2014) proposed a method that predicts the next values in a time series such that local measures of nonlinearity, e.g., Lyapunov exponent, are as smooth as possible



Matthew J. Graham

Going deep



- Trendy, good for funding proposals (preaching to the choir)
- Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) are good for images
- Need to convert time series to image:
 - Wang & Oates (2015), Hatami (2017)
 - Mahabal et al. (2017) use dm-dt mechanism with variable stars



Going deeper



 Some neural networks architectures have "memory" connections between links forming directed cycles, e.g., echo state, LSTMs, GRUs, etc. good for time series



-1.0

-1.5

-2.0-2.5

-3.0 -3.5

-4.0¹/₄₃

44

log₁₀(Variance)



Matthew J. Graham

Deep modelling of time series



- Autoencoder model with RNN autoencoder:
 - Consider: $(y_0, \Delta t_0) \oplus (\Delta t_0) \rightarrow y_1$
 - Consider: $(y_0, \Delta t_1, \dot{y}_0, \ddot{y}_0) \rightarrow y_1$

• 12,000 quasars with $\Delta t = 500$ days



QSOs with RNNs



F

Comparing with DRW



Matthew J. Graham

Better than DRW



• Generate DRW light curves and fit with RNN and OU models:



• Fitting OU models underestimates parameter values:



• True model agrees with RNN:



Deep time series features





(Tachibana et al. 2019)

Physical correlations





Evidence for asymmetry





- Magnitude of asymmetry decreases as luminosity or black hole mass increases
- Consistent with self-organized disk instability model

Slow to detect as transient phenomena





Matthew J. Graham



26 June 2019





- Aperiodic sources form the majority of the astrophysical population but remain the lesser studied
- Aperiodicity can be quantified
- Quasars can be modeled via Gaussian processes and smoothed local nonlinearity but RNN autoencoders provide a better model compared to DRW
- There are features which correlate with physical parameters
- The arrow of time is detectable
- Forecasting seems tractable
- Investigating other architectures:
 - Transformer, LSTM + GAN
 - Neural differential equations to handle irregular sampling
 - Asymmetry aware networks